UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RALPH COUNTRYMAN) 3:10-cv-00107-LRH-WGC
Plaintiff,) <u>MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS</u>
vs.	June 20, 2012
STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,))
Defendants.)))
PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIA	M G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
DEPUTY CLERK: <u>KATIE LYNN OGDI</u>	EN REPORTER: FTR
COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): RALPE	H COUNTRYMAN, In Pro Per (Telephonically)
COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NATI	HAN L. HASTINGS

PROCEEDINGS: STATUS CONFERENCE

9:02 a.m. Court convenes.

The Court briefly reviews the status of this matter. Plaintiff is initially advised that the court order, dated May 31, 2012, (Dkt. No. 56), denied his motion to "Exclude all Documents not Produced During Discovery" (Dkt. No. 51) as such a request should be addressed in the parties' pretrial order.

The parties are advised that in response to Defendants' Motion for a Status Conference (Dkt. No. 60), this hearing today will address Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (Dkt. No. 58) and Plaintiff's Motion to Stay Pending the Outcome of Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (Dkt. No. 59). The Court when granting Defendants' motion for a status conference also stated that the Defendants need not file responses to plaintiff's motions for sanctions and stay (Dkt. No. 62).

Although written oppositions to Plaintiff's two motions have not been submitted by the defendants, Deputy Attorney General Hastings indicates that it is his intention to respond to and oppose the motions orally during this hearing. The Court has no objection. Plaintiff Countryman indicates that he has not responded to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment in anticipation of the Court's decision regarding his motion to stay.

The Court thereupon addresses Plaintiff's motion for sanctions. Mr. Countryman advises the Court of specific documents within Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 52) that

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

3:10-cv-00107-LRH-WGC

Date: June 20, 2012

Page 2

allegedly are "fraudulent documents" and constitute "false certification" of Mr. Countryman's respective position regarding this matter. After hearing argument from both parties, the Court questions the legitimacy of Plaintiff's contentions regarding the evidence contained in Defendants' motion for summary judgment. The Court determines, however, that Plaintiff's arguments regarding the evidence utilized by the Defendants' in their motion for summary judgment may, and should, be addressed in his opposition to that motion.

Therefore, Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (Dkt. No. 58) is **DENIED**. Consequently, Plaintiff's Motion to Stay Summary Judgment Pending the Outcome the Motion for Sanctions (Dkt. No. 59) thereby becomes moot and is **DENIED**.

The Court will allow for an extension of time for Mr. Countryman to respond to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. Plaintiff shall have up to and including **July 6, 2012**, to file his opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 52). Defendants thereafter shall have up to and including **July 27, 2012**, to file a reply to the opposition.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

9:36 a.m. Court adjourn

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: /s/
Katie Lynn Ogden, Deputy Clerk